

## REMARKS

Claim 14 has been amended.

Claims 1 – 64 are present in the subject application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has allowed claims 33 – 39 and 42 – 48 and has rejected claims 1 – 32, 40 – 41 and 49 - 64 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 32, 40 – 41 and 49 - 64 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner takes the position that that the terms recited in claim 1 of “said channel receiver”, “said output signals”, “said detection signals” and “said one detection signal” each lack sufficient antecedent basis within the claim. The Examiner indicates that this further applies to the recitation of the terms “said channel receiver”, “said output signals” and “said one detection signal” within dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 9, 15, 17, 18, 22, 28, 32, 55 and 61. The Examiner further alleges that the terms “said one output signal” (claim 14), “said threshold signals” (claim 40) and “said channel processors” (claim 49) similarly lack sufficient antecedent basis within those claims.

These rejections are respectfully traversed since the claims clearly provide antecedent basis for the above claim terms. In particular, the preamble of claims 1, 22 and 55 (Lines 1 – 2) recites a channelizing receiver including “a plurality of channel receivers” with “each channel receiver” including the limitations in the respective claims. Thus, antecedent basis is clearly provided for the term “said channel receiver” recited within these claims.

Claims 5, 7, 9, 17, 18, 28, 32 and 61 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 22 or 55 and similarly recite the term “said channel receiver”. Since this term is recited in the parent claims, these claims are considered to have sufficient antecedent basis for that term.

Further, claim 1 recites a plurality of filters each transmitting “an output signal” representing electromagnetic signals (Lines 3 – 6). Since a plurality of filters each produce “an output signal”, the collective output of the filters includes a plurality of “output signals”. Accordingly, sufficient antecedent basis exists for recitations of the term “said output signals” within claim 1. Claim 15 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and similarly recites the term “said output signals”. Since this term is recited in the parent claim as discussed above, claim 15 is considered to have sufficient antecedent basis for that term.

Moreover, claim 1 recites a plurality of threshold detectors each producing “a detection signal” (Lines 7 - 9). Since a plurality of threshold detectors each produce “a detection signal”, the collective output of the threshold detectors includes a plurality of “detection signals”. Accordingly, sufficient antecedent basis exists for recitations of the term “said detection signals” within claim 1.

In addition, claim 1 recites a signal amplitude calculation unit for starting an initial timing period in response to receipt of “one of said detection signals” (Lines 10 – 14). Thus, antecedent basis is clearly provided for the term “said one detection signal” recited within claim 1. Claim 4 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and similarly recites the term “said one detection signal”. Since this term is recited in the parent claim as discussed above, claim 4 is considered to have sufficient antecedent basis for that term.

Claim 14 depends from claim 1, where claim 1 recites a magnitude signal providing the magnitude during the initial timing period of the “output signal” to which the “one detection signal” corresponds (Lines 12 – 14). Thus, antecedent basis is clearly provided for the term “said one output signal” recited in dependent claim 14. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, the term “said one output signal” has been changed to “said corresponding output signal” to further clarify the claim language.


Claim 40 depends from claim 39, where claim 39 recites a plurality of threshold detectors with each of said threshold detectors producing a “threshold signal” (Lines 4 - 6). Since a plurality of threshold detectors each produce “a threshold signal”, the collective output of the threshold detectors includes a plurality of “threshold signals”. Accordingly, sufficient antecedent basis exists for recitations of the term “said threshold signals” within dependent claim 40.

Claim 49 recites a channelizing receiver having a plurality of channels (Lines 3 – 5) and providing for each channel a “channel processor” (Line 6). Since a plurality of channels each include a channel processor, the channels collectively include a plurality of “channel processors”. Accordingly, sufficient antecedent basis exists for recitations of the term “said channel processors” within claim 49.

Since claims 1 – 32, 40 – 41 and 49 - 64 provide sufficient antecedent basis for claim terms as discussed above, these claims are considered to be definite and comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The application, having been shown to overcome issues raised in the Office Action, is considered to be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Stuart B. Shapiro", is written over a horizontal line.

Stuart B. Shapiro  
Registration No. 40,169

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC  
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400  
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3164  
(301) 424-3640

Hand Delivered: OCTOBER 28, 2005